

unanimous consent that the rules of procedure of the Committee on Appropriations for the 117th Congress be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE RULES—117TH CONGRESS

I. MEETINGS

The Committee will meet at the call of the Chairman.

II. QUORUMS

1. Reporting a bill. A majority of the members must be present for the reporting of a bill.

2. Other business. For the purpose of transacting business other than reporting a bill or taking testimony, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

3. Taking testimony. For the purpose of taking testimony, other than sworn testimony, by the Committee or any subcommittee, one member of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony by the Committee, three members shall constitute a quorum, and for the taking of sworn testimony by any subcommittee, one member shall constitute a quorum.

III. PROXIES

Except for the reporting of a bill, votes may be cast by proxy when any member so requests.

IV. ATTENDANCE OF STAFF MEMBERS AT CLOSED SESSIONS

Attendance of staff members at closed sessions of the Committee shall be limited to those members of the Committee staff who have a responsibility associated with the matter being considered at such meeting. This rule may be waived by unanimous consent.

V. BROADCASTING AND PHOTOGRAPHING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee or any of its subcommittees may permit the photographing and broadcast of open hearings by television and/or radio. However, if any member of a subcommittee objects to the photographing or broadcasting of an open hearing, the question shall be referred to the full Committee for its decision.

VI. AVAILABILITY OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

To the extent possible, when the bill and report of any subcommittee are available, they shall be furnished to each member of the Committee thirty-six hours prior to the Committee's consideration of said bill and report.

VII. AMENDMENTS AND REPORT LANGUAGE

To the extent possible, amendments and report language intended to be proposed by Senators at full Committee markups shall be provided in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member and the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member twenty-four hours prior to such markups.

VIII. POINTS OF ORDER

Any member of the Committee who is floor manager of an appropriations bill is hereby authorized to make points of order against any amendment offered in violation of the Senate Rules on the floor of the Senate to such appropriations bill.

IX. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members but shall have no vote

in the subcommittee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTINA NOLAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to a great Vermonter, Christina Nolan, a most dedicated public servant who has served as U.S. attorney for the District of Vermont since November 2017. She will be resigning her post at the end of this month, 11 years since she first joined the U.S. Attorney's Office, but her work and the strong partnerships she forged will carry on for many years to come.

A profile of Christina recently appeared in Vermont Business Magazine under the headline "A Born Advocate for Justice." And she has been just that. During her tenure, Christina worked to stem the deadly surge of heroin and fentanyl in our small State, and she has joined with Federal partners to slow the illegal trafficking of firearms. She has also used her voice to shine a spotlight on domestic violence and human trafficking, not only prosecuting critical cases but also highlighting the plight of victims who are caught in the path of such heinous crimes. Her personal approach to each and every case, signing off on every charging document in the office, as well as her commitment to victims and her dedication to upholding the rule of law are evident to anyone who has witnessed her work and her work ethic.

While Vermont's U.S. Attorney's Office is among the smallest in the country, it is fair to say that under Christina's leadership, the team has punched well above their weight. In one instance, her office set out to investigate kickbacks and fraudulent billing practices involving the electronic health records industry, unraveling a scheme that resulted in an \$8 billion national settlement with Perdue Pharma, which admitted to needlessly and shamelessly promoting the prescribed use of OxyContin, a highly addictive opioid.

During her time as U.S. attorney, Christina has forged strong relationships with her partners in Federal, State and local law enforcement circles, many of whom have shared with me how much they appreciated her engagement. In the courtroom, colleagues on both sides of the bench have lauded her fairness. A Federal judge, interviewed for the aforementioned magazine profile, spoke of her "quiet confidence" and her "natural courtroom presence: graceful and commanding."

I am proud to have worked with Gov. Phil Scott to recommend Christina Nolan for the position of U.S. attorney back in 2017. She has served Vermonters very well during her tenure. Marcelle and I wish Christina and her longtime partner, Jill, and their family our very best in future endeavors.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, just barely a year ago, I was here making a similar statement. Impeachment is one of the most solemn matters to come before the Senate, but I worry that it's also becoming a common occurrence.

Before getting into the merits of this impeachment, it is important to reiterate that January 6 was a sad and tragic day for America. I hope we can all agree about that.

What happened here at the Capitol was completely inexcusable. It was not a demonstration of any of our protected, inalienable rights. It was a direct, violent attack on our seat of government. Those who plowed over police barricades, assaulted law enforcement, and desecrated our monument to representative democracy flouted the rule of law and disgraced our Nation. Six people, including two U.S. Capitol Police officers, now lie dead in the wake of this assault. The perpetrators must be brought to justice, and I am glad to see that many such cases are progressing around the country.

While the ultimate responsibility for this attack rests upon the shoulders of those who unlawfully entered the Capitol, everyone involved must take responsibility for their destructive actions that day, including the former President. As the leader of the Nation, all Presidents bear some responsibility for the actions that they inspire—good or bad. Undoubtedly, then-President Trump displayed poor leadership in his words and actions. I do not defend those actions and my vote should not be read as a defense of those actions.

I am a member of a Court of Impeachment. My job is to vote on the case brought by the House managers. I took an oath to render judgment on the Article of Impeachment sent to the Senate by the House of Representatives. We are confined to considering only the Articles charged and the facts presented.

First and foremost, I don't think this impeachment is proper under the Constitution. This is the first time the Senate has tried a former President. Whether or not it can do so is a difficult question. The Constitution doesn't say in black and white "Yes, the Senate can try a former President" or "No, it can't." In contrast, many State constitutions at the time of the founding specified that their legislatures could, so it's notable that our Federal charter did not. In order to answer this question it's therefore necessary to look at the text, structure, and history of the Constitution. That's what I have done. In the end, I do not think we have the ability to try a former President.

I start always with the Constitution, which gives Congress the power of impeachment. As I mentioned, impeachment was a feature in many State constitutions at the time, and it came from a power enjoyed by the English Parliament.

Impeachment in England was a powerful tool whereby Parliament could